

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **7 August 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-25. Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 22-24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten. Claims 1-20 were allowed. Claims 21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Yeager et al. (US Pub. No. 2005/0086300 hereinafter “Yeager”), and Francis et al. (USPN 5,331,637 hereinafter “Francis”).

Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being lack of antecedent. Applicant has amended claim 21 replacing “apparatus” with “system” in line 3 and 4, thus overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeager in view of Francis. Claims 22-24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicant has rewritten claim 22 in independent form as claim 21. Dependent claims 22 and 25 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 23-24, which depend upon claim 21, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims. Claims 1-20 were previously allowed. Claims 22 and 25 are cancelled.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 29 August 2007

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com